

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/517,424	BEZZEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAJ K. OLSEN	1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KAJ K. OLSEN. (3) _____

(2) Obert Chu. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 01 February 2010.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lindmayer, Swet, Rosenberg, and Walker.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Possible amendments to overcome the outstanding 112 rejection of claim 22 was discussed. Applicant's representative also distinctions between the present invention and the relied on prior art. The examiner discussed possible amendments that he believes might overcome the outstanding prior art rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.